

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1901-2
(Separate Revenue)

File No. 66-01

Serial Nos. 1-4

B
~~Papers Filed.~~

Month *Nov '01*

SUBJECT.

Refund of tree tax, Cess, etc.

Bohannan and Rao

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

Serials 5-6(MB)SRF.66-01, m
21 Nov 01.

Serials, Not 4(B)SR 224-02
1-2

29-9-02
Underman
Messeri
16/4/14

SR 66-01
SL 1

SECTION	(1)
FILE No.	
SERIAL No.	

SECTION	<i>S. R</i>
FILE No.	<i>66-01</i>
SERIAL No.	<i>7</i>

The subsequent difference between the owners & the licensee until the latter was refunded.

(u) What is the practice in this respect in Madison?

The Grand Jurors involved in an important case raising as it does a question of justice.

Issue as above *2579/01.*

2579 *Mr. [Signature]*

15/9/01

3

SECTION <u>S R</u>
FILE No. <u>6466-01</u>
SERIAL No. <u>142</u>
SECTION

(10)

The Excise Commr.
 No. 5742 of 2/10/1901
 Dated September 1901

His letter no. 2145
90
 dated 17th September 1901
 forwarding for sanction, a
 refund bill for Rs 10-10-0
 in favour of one, Sannepowda,
 licensee of Attigundi toddy
 shop in the Chikmagalur taluk
 for 1900-1901, on the ground that
 being the amount of one-third
 of the tree tax on 30 date trees, on
 the ground that the trees could
 not be tapped by the licensee
 owing to some dispute between
 himself & the owner of the trees.

Has the honor to state that
 the point involved in the above
 is an important one raising as
 it does a question of principle,
 and to _____

With reference to
 the above has the honor to
 request that information
 may be furnished.

on the following points! —

(1) was not the application
for trees countersigned
by the owner of the trees
in question?

(2) If it was not, why did
the local authorities take
any action upon it?

(3) If it was, how does the
subsequent difference between
the owners and the licensee,
entitle the latter to a refund?

(4) What is the practice
in this respect in Madras?

" B O "

1/11

26/9/21

(The Secy) | For Secretary

10
26/9/07

SECTION	SR
FILE No.	66-01
SERIAL No.	4

(12) 7

Correspondence
 reading with 4th
 Commr's letter no $\frac{2509}{110}$
 dated 5th October 1907
 re. the refused bill
 for Rs 10.10.0 being
 the amount of one
 third portion of the
 tree tax on 30 trees
 applied for by Same
 Gowda, licensee of
 the Atigundi toddy
 shop, Chickmagalur
 Taluk for the year
 1900 - 1901 & stating
 that the refused is
 recommended as
 the licensee did not
 tap the trees owing
 to some dispute being
 subsequently arisen
 between himself and
 the owner of the trees
 whose countersignature
 to the application
 for the trees had not

been secured as
required by the Rules.

Order Thereon

V. No 7212-21
4.7.18-98

of 6/11/01

The refund bill
submitted with the
above is sanctioned
with the observation
that the omission
on the part of the
local authorities
to refuse to take
action in the absence
of the countersignature,
required by the Rules,
of the owners of the
trees in question was
culpable and should
have been guarded
against. In such
important matters
as this, a strict

(10)

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore, Excise, dated 6th November 1901.

READ—

Correspondence ending with Excise Commissioner's letter No. 2509—110, dated 5th—8th October 1901, *re* the refund bill for Rs. 10-10-0 being the amount of one-third portion of the tree-tax on 30 trees applied for by Sannegauda, licensee of the Attigundi toddy shop, Chikmagalur taluk, for the year 1900-01, and stating that the refund is recommended as the licensee did not tap the trees owing to some dispute having 'subsequently arisen between himself and the owner of the trees whose countersignature to the application for the trees had not been secured as required by the Rules.

No. 7212-21—EX. F. 18-98, DATED BANGALORE, 6TH NOVEMBER 1901.

ORDER THEREON—The refund bill submitted with the above is sanctioned with the observation that the omission on the part of the local authorities to refuse to take action in the absence of the countersignature, required by the Rules, of the owners of the trees in question, was culpable and should have been guarded against. In such important matters as this, a strict adherence to the Rules should be enjoined on all Officers concerned.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

The Comptroller, Mysore Government with sanctioned bill.

The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.

Exd.—J.T.R.

~~1901-1902~~

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

EXCISE

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 6th November 1901

No. 7212-21
Ex. F. 18-98

Sanctioning, with certain observations,
a refund bill for Rs. 10-10-0 in favor of
Sannegauda, licensee of Attigundi toddy
shop, Chikmagalur taluk, for the year
1900-01.